



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/879,117	06/13/2001	Johan Wanselin	003300-794	3882

7590

06/30/2006

Benton S. Duffett, Jr.
BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.
P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER

CHORBAJI, MONZER R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1744

DATE MAILED: 06/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/879,117	Applicant(s) WANSELIN ET AL.	
	Examiner MONZER R. CHORBAJI	Art Unit 1744	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 May 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 October 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>05/25/2006</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This non-final action is in response to the RCE/Amendment received on 05/26/2006

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 1 and 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huston et al (U.S.P.N. 3,407,027) in view of Hennebert et al (U.S.P.N. 4,764,351).

Regarding claim 1, Huston discloses a sterilization chamber (figure 1:14) within an autoclave device (figure 1:10) that includes the following: housing (figure 1:12, 15 and 17), pressure means (an autoclave device necessarily uses steam, which is the pressure means), front planar wall surface (unlabeled planar front wall surface of chamber 14 in figure 2) that includes a front opening, rear planar wall surface (unlabeled planar rear wall surface of chamber adjacent to housing 17 in figure 1), chamber body portion disposed between the front and the rear surfaces (unlabeled region of chamber 14 between both surfaces in figure 1), chamber is capable of being releasably fastened within the autoclave device (figure 1:14, 28 and figure 2:14, 27, 23) such that the front (front end of chamber 14 is directly connected to 15 of the housing as shown in figure 2) and the rear wall surfaces (rear end of chamber 14 is directly connected to 17 of the housing as shown in figure 1) are directly connected to the housing of the autoclave device (figure 1:10). Huston teaches that the inner shell (sterilization chamber) is to be manufactured from corrosion resistant material (col.1, lines 48-52), but fails to explicitly teach the type of building material. Yet it is known in the art to form chambers from either stainless steel or plastics. In addition, Huston fails to explicitly recite the presence of steam inlet within the wall of the chamber that is necessary for inputting steam into the chamber and the explicit presence of display means in the autoclave device. Hennebert teaches that various pressures within the chamber can be operated (col.2, lines 47-58 and col.9, lines 47-52) and further

discloses the following: chamber is constructed of plastic material (col.5, lines 17-27, col.6, lines 53-55 and col.9, lines 10-16), steam inlet within the wall of the chamber (figure 1:1 and 17) and the use of thermostat that necessarily includes displaying temperature readings. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to construct Huston chamber out of polymeric material as taught by Hennebert since plastic is low in cost and does not conduct electricity (Hennebert, col.5, lines 23-25 and col.6, lines 53-54) and to further add thermostat to Huston device in order to insure that temperature within the chamber is maintained within the intended range (Hennebert, col.7, lines 67-68 and col.8, lines 1-2) so that sterilization is achieved efficiently.

Regarding claims 11-12 and 14-15, Huston teaches the following: a chamber that is capable of being releasably fastened within the autoclave device (figure 1:14, 28 and figure 2:14, 27, 23), chamber is essentially manufactured in one continuous piece (figure 1:14), chamber is sealed by a movable sealing door (figure 2:11) and a sterilization cycle (autoclaving) is to be performed in the sterilization device (figure 1:10).

Regarding claim 13, Huston fails to explicitly recite the presence of steam inlet within the wall of the chamber that is necessary for inputting steam into the chamber. Hennebert teaches an integral steam inlet within the wall of the chamber (figure 1:1,17 and unlabeled integral opening in chamber for inputting steam). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further add an integral opening into the wall of Huston chamber as taught by

Hennebert (figure 1:1, 17) so that steam is directly added into the space of chamber resulting in faster increasing pressure and temperature within the chamber.

5. Claims 2, 5-6 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huston et al (U.S.P.N. 3,407,027) in view of Hennebert et al (U.S.P.N. 4,764,351) as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Spence (U.S.P.N. 4,919,888)

Regarding claims 2 and 5-6, Huston and Hennebert fail to teach the following: chamber is manufactured from an injection-mouldable material, injection-mouldable material essentially is a polyamide material and the chamber is manufactured from a composite material. Spence teaches the following: chamber is manufactured from an injection-mouldable material (col.4, lines 36-37 and line 31), injection-mouldable material essentially is a polyamide material (col.4, lines 36-37 and line 31) and the chamber is manufactured from a composite material (col.4, line 31). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute construction material of Huston chamber with polymeric material as taught by Spence since such materials are not adversely affected by the sterilant or by the sterilization conditions (Spence, col.4, lines 30-33).

Regarding claim 19, Huston discloses a chamber (figure 1:14) that is capable of being releasably mounted and fastened within the autoclave device (figure 1:14, 28 and figure 2:14, 27, 23).

6. Claims 3-4, 7-9 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huston et al (U.S.P.N. 3,407,027) in view of Hennebert et al

Art Unit: 1744

(U.S.P.N. 4,764,351) and Spence (U.S.P.N. 4,919,888) as applied to claims 2 and 6 and further in view of Quehl (U.S.P.N. 4,165,404).

Regarding claims 3-4, 7 and 9, Huston, Hennebert and Spence all fail to teach the following: the use of a reinforcement material such as rowing weave, the use of carbon fiber, a concatenating polymer material such as an epoxy material and the use of a glass fiber rowing weave. Quehl teaches the following: the use of a reinforcement material such as rowing weave (col.2, lines 11-14 and line 45) arranged around the injection mouldable material (col.7, lines 24-27 and lines 48-50), and the use of carbon fiber (col.2, line 44) and a concatenating polymer material such as an epoxy material (col.6, lines 10-12), the use of glass fiber (col.2, line 44) and a concatenating polymer material (col.6, lines 10-12). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the constituting material of Huston chamber by including glass or carbon fibers because of their desirable physical properties as evidenced by Quehl (Quehl, col.2, lines 47-48).

Regarding claims 8 and 16-18, Huston, Hennebert and Spence all fail to teach the following: the use of a reinforcement material such as rowing weave, the use of carbon fiber and a concatenating polymer material such as an epoxy material. Quehl teaches the following: the use of a reinforcement material such as rowing weave (col.2, lines 11-14 and line 45) arranged around the injection mouldable material (col.7, lines 24-27 and lines 48-50), the use of carbon fiber (col.2, line 44) and a concatenating polymer material such as an epoxy material (col.6, lines 10-12), the use of glass fiber (col.2, line 44) and a concatenating polymer material (col.6, lines 10-12). Therefore, it

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the constituting material of Huston chamber by including glass or carbon fibers because of their desirable physical properties as evidenced by Quehl (Quehl, col.2, lines 47-48).

7. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huston et al (U.S.P.N. 3,407,027) in view of Hennebert et al (U.S.P.N. 4,764,351), Spence (U.S.P.N. 4,919,888) and Quehl (U.S.P.N. 4,165,404) as applied to claim 9 and further in view of Leimbacher et al (U.S.P.N. 5,837,181).

Huston, Hennebert, Spence and Quehl all fail to teach the use of specific types of concatenating polymers as recited in the claim. However, Limbacher teaches the use of polyvinyl alcohol fibers (col.5, lines 25-26). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Huston chamber by including polyvinyl alcohol since such a fiber is known to have a high modulus as taught by Leimbacher in col.5; lines 25-26.

8. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huston et al (U.S.P.N. 3,407,027) in view of Hennebert et al (U.S.P.N. 4,764,351) as applied to claim 14 and further in view of Houston et al (U.S.P.N. 5,894,014).

Huston and Hennebert fail to teach a chamber having a pair of integrally formed tracks in which the sealing chamber door may be slidably mounted. Houston teaches that the chamber door is slidably mounted (col.2, lines 61-64) and that the chamber door is provided with a pair of integrally formed tracks (figure 2:44) such that the tracks and the chamber are capable of being removed simultaneously. Therefore, it

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute Huston chamber door with a slidably mountable chamber door with a pair of formed tracks as taught by Houston since vertically slidable chamber door makes loading and unloading of items into and out of the autoclave easier and safer than other types of doors.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Hall (U.S.P.N. 810,533), Schipanski (U.S.P.N. 2,526,974) and Jewell et al (U.S.P.N. 2,592,705) all teach a sterilization chamber having planar front and rear wall surface in direct contact with the autoclave housing. Gut Boucher (U.S.P.N. 4,207,286) teaches that chambers are constructed from plastic material. The Canadian Building Digest Internet printout teaches that plastics are known to be corrosion resistant.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MONZER R. CHORBAJI whose telephone number is (571) 272-1271. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:30.

12. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, GLADYS J. CORCORAN can be reached on (571) 272-1214. The fax

Art Unit: 1744

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

13. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Monzer R. Chorbaji *MRC*
06/19/2006


GLADYS J. CORCORAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER